

OPERATING BUDGET
PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION COMMITTEE
of the
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

Minutes

The Operating Budget Meeting of the Public Safety and Public Information Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on **October 25, 2004.**

-

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Angie Carpenter • Chairperson

Legislator Peter O'Leary

Legislator Davis Bishop

Legislator William Lindsay

Legislator Daniel Losquadro

Legislator Lynne Nowick

-

-

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Mea Knapp • Counsel to the Legislature

Richard Dormer • Deputy Commissioner SCPD

Alfred Tisch • Sheriff of Suffolk County

Alan Otto • Sheriff's Department

Undersheriff Sullivan • Sheriff's Department.

John Desmond • Director/Department of Probation

Joseph Williams • Deputy Commissioner • FRES

Warren Horst • Chief Fire Marshall

Tom Kost • Deputy Director of the Fire Academy

All other interested parties

-

-

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano • Court Stenographer

(* THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:15 A.M. *)

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Good morning. We are going to begin the hearing on Public Safety for the 2005 Operating Budget, and I would just ask Legislator Nowick to please lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

SALUTATION

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you. I apologize for the delay. We did have an earlier start to give us more time because there is another meeting after us, and I guess there was a little bit of a mix up, but we will begin. And Budget Review is here, and I see all of the departments. And what we're going to do is start with the DA's Office, if you would come forward first, because there was very little on little on that, then I think we will go to the Sheriff, the Police Department and down the line. If you would, just for the record, share your names with the stenographer.

MR. KEARON:

Good morning. My name is Robert Kearon. I am Division Chief with the District Attorney's Office, and this gentleman to the right, his name is Lon Kochany, he is our Chief Management Analyst, in effect, our budget guru. I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the proposed budget for our department. While I'm here I'd like to thank Jim Spero and Sean Clancy who is our Budget Analyst from Legislative Budget Review. I'd also like to thank Jan Moore from the County Executive's Budget Office who is in the audience with us, and she is assigned to our department as well.

As far as the budget that has been proposed, we thank the County Executive. We think we have been adequately funded with respect to all the positions in our budget. We agree with Mr. Clancy's analysis of the budget. And there's just one thing I'd like to request, something that is not contained in the budget that has been submitted by the County Executive, and that is to request the addition of two positions, one being a clerk typist to help us manage the ever

increasing flow of paperwork that has been generated since Mr. Spota has taken office. It's a direct result of the investigative efforts that we have engaged in over the last couple of years. We have had a tremendous increase in the number of indictments, particularly in the area of political corruption. And none of that work gets done unless there's someone to input data into computers and print out indictments. And we would respectfully request that we have our payroll increased by one clerk typist to help us with that.

One other position we'd asked for consideration is to have added to our budget called •• which is known as a District Attorney Operation's Aide. That is a Grade 11 position, again, which is a relatively inexpensive position that would be added to our budget. What we envision happening over the coming years is an ever increasing utilization of Power Point presentations during the course of trials. Power Point is a very effective tool when used by a prosecutor, especially during his summation or her summation. It's a very effective way of marshalling the evidence and would greatly enhance our presentation during our closing arguments to juries. We envision that person would be working in Riverhead primarily helping all the felony trial bureau assistants while they're trying cases.

I'd like to point that we think there's more than adequate funding currently in Mr. Levy's proposal to fund these two additional positions, so we're not asking any additional monies from the Legislature, just the addition of two positions.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Well, that certainly makes it easier. I do note in BRO's report that you had requested seven clerk typists, and they had recommended three.

MR. KEARON:

That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

So by asking for the one, you are actually working with the County Executive and trying to do with less, but you really feel the need for the additional clerk typist and operations aide.

MR. KEARON:

That's correct. We are still struggling to catch up with the clerical position we lost during the early retirement incentive from two years ago, but we think with the addition of the one clerk

typist beyond what Mr. Levy provided us that we should be all right for 2005.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. I have a question for you. Budget Review made the recommendation that there be some provision for you to review the list of decommissioned vehicles. Do you feel that has merit and ••

MR. KEARON:

I have some reservations. I don't want to at this point give you a flat out indication that we don't think it's viable. I am certainly willing to take a look at it, but by its very nature, these are decommissioned vehicles, and they're decommissioned for a reason, usually because of the high milage that's associated with the vehicles. And unless we can be assured that the vehicle that we are going to get is a very reliable vehicle, because these vehicles would be used during undercover surveillances, and that doesn't mean that they just sit there and the person inside the vehicle looks at something. Frequently what happens is after there's a period of observation, somebody that we're looking at is getting into a vehicle and moving along sometimes on the Expressway at a high rate of speed, and we have to follow them. So unless these vehicles we can be assured are very reliable, they wouldn't be of any use to us, but we're willing to take a look at the proposal.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

All right. Are there any questions or comments from any members? Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

I just wanted to clarify, the clerk typist you wanted, three were recommended, don't want the three, you just want the one?

MR. KEARON:

No.

LEG. NOWICK:

Oh, you want four.

MR. KEARON:

Well, all the positions that the County Executive has given us, we definitely want. We're asking you if you would give us one additional beyond what he gave us.

LEG. NOWICK:

I was a little confused. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. If there are no other questions or comments, I thank you very much for coming down, and we certainly will see what we can do.

MR. KEARON:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you. Next is the Sheriff. And I see the Police Commissioner has also arrived, so you guys will be up next. And the Sheriff's is on page 378 of BRO's report. Good morning.

SHERIFF TISCH:

Good morning, Legislator Carpenter. Good morning, Legislator Losquadro, Legislator Nowick, Counsel Knapp. At this time, I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to discuss with you the Sheriff's Office 2005 Operating Budget as recommended by the County Executive's Office and your Office of Budget Review. At this time, I will request members of my staff to commence with our presentation. Chief Otto will know address our concerns.

CHIEF OTTO:

Good morning. First I'd like to thank Budget Review and in particular Jim Spero and Jim Maggio for the excellent job they did on preparing this budget, this report. We all just know how difficult it is to evaluate a department or office budget. Not only did they do a great job, but just imagine being the analyst assigned to review the Sheriff's Office for the first time and to complete his review within a few short weeks. Now only was this accomplished, but it was done in such a way that it's very obvious everyone knew what they were talking about. Again, I thank you both for your dedication to duty.

The Sheriff's Office presentation focuses on six general areas of concern. These areas substitute jail funding, Gabreski Airport, staffing, overtime, vehicles and equipment and

supplies. This time I'll turnover it over to Deputy Warden Rubacka.

DEPUTY WARDEN RUBACKA:

Thank you. We regret to inform you that overcrowding of our Correction System continues to be a problem of the first magnitude. On October 12th, we reached a high •• a year high of 1702 prisoners, 514 prisoners over our legal capacity of 1188. Variances granted by the Commission of Corrections allowed us to house approximately half of these 514 prisoners in make shift housing throughout our facilities. However, we are forced to house the balance, currently 265 inmates in substitute jails throughout the state.

The Sheriff's Office had requested \$5 million in 2005 for substitute jail funding. The County Executive is recommended only \$1 million based in part upon the (SPRUNGS) unit being operational in early 2005. The Sheriff's Office feels that this may not occur until early 2006, one year later. BRO has concurred with our request of \$5 million. It is projected that substitute jail housing for 2004 will surpass \$4.5 million. In fact, for the month of October alone, substitute jail housing could exceed \$800,000. The Sheriff's Office sees no reason to suspect that a steady flow of inmates to substitute jails will decrease in 2005. Therefore, it is more than appropriate to request the full \$5 million in the 2005 Operating Budget for substitute jail housing.

This \$5 million only reflects the cost of housing the inmates. Deputy Sheriff and Correction Officer overtime, gas, motels, meals and tools add on at least another \$500,000. To date Deputy Sheriff transport costs alone amount to \$356,000. Another significant cost is attributed to the extreme wear and tear that our vehicles are being subjected to due to the excessive miles being placed on them. It is not uncommon to have our new vehicles being driven 6000 in one month, cutting the useful life of these vehicles from three years to 18 months. This will increase the number of vehicles that need to be decommissioned annually as well as the repair cost to keep them running safely. This will be covered later •• detailed later in the presentation.

Budget Review has pointed out that since the hiring of Correction Officers cannot occur until September, 2005, there will be a \$1.36 million surplus in the contingency account for the hiring of these officers. BRO has suggested that these funds can be used to offset some of the substitute jail costs. However, with the 1.36 million in contingency funds and the one million

that the County Executive recommended, an additional 2.7 million for substitute jails will still be required. Finally, state law mandates that whenever legal capacities are exceeded, even without the correct level of funding for substitute jail housing, inmates will still have to be transferred to alternate housing since state law mandates this action whenever conditions warrant.

I would like to now speak on Gabreski Airport. In the County Executive's budget, it is recommended that Deputy Sheriffs assigned to Gabreski Airport be transferred to other duties. It should be noted that the very first recommendation by BRO is to return these Deputy Sheriffs along with their appropriate salaries, supplies and equipment back to the airport. Not only does the Sheriff's Office concur with this recommendation, but we believe that the presence of police officers at Gabreski Airport, a general aviation airport, is now mandated by New York State Law, specifically, the Anti Terrorist Preparedness Act of 2004, which was signed into law on June 23rd. This law requires that general aviation airports in New York State comply with the Transportation Security Administration's recommendations.

One of the issues the County Executive's Office has raised with regard to Deputy Sheriffs at Gabreski is the amount of overtime which appears to have been worked at the airport. This is extremely misleading in that overtime shown does not present an accurate picture. More specifically in 2004, a total of \$206,962 in overtime appears in the Gabreski appropriation, however, in reality only \$73,911 in overtime was for staff coverage of the airport. The balance or two-thirds of the overtime worked by these deputies who were assigned to Gabreski was actually worked in other Deputy Sheriff functions. This was detailed in our budget request which explained that by far, the majority of this overtime was worked in sections other than the airport. In conversations with BRO, it was apparent that something had to be done to correct the situation. The Sheriff's Office has now taken steps to rectify this problem by isolating and tracking the overtime that is attributed solely to the Gabreski detail. The new procedure will be initiated on January 1st.

The next area of concern is staffing. The 2005 recommended Operating Budget for the Sheriff's Office creates eight new clerical positions for civilianization, 20 new Deputy Sheriff positions and 50 Correction Officer positions to reduce overtime. BRO agrees with the County Executive's recommendations. It should be noted that BRO incorrectly identified the Sheriff's Office's request for an administrator one to be assigned to the civil bureau. Based upon this misunderstanding, they disapproved our request. In reality, we requested the administrator

one to be assigned directly to the Chief of Staff's Office, and is, in fact, more than justified. The Chief of Staff's Office has commanding control over the accounting section, personnel and payroll, employee benefits and the quartermaster section.

In addition to managing the Operating and Capital Budgets, the Chief Staff's Office is also responsible for overseeing all new construction, asset forfeiture accounts, Freedom of Information requests, the medical evaluation unit, claims investigations and the entire Sheriff's Academy. At the current time, there's only one clerical position assigned to the Chief of Staff. With the approval of the administrator one, the coordination between these functions and commands as they relate in the Chief of Staff's operations would more than benefit the Sheriff's Office and the County. We respectfully request that the administrator one position be approved for the Chief of Staff's Office and be placed in appropriation 3110•0100.

With regard to civilianization, the Sheriff's Office will work closely with BRO to ensure that the eight new civilian positions will be assigned to correct appropriations. An important concern should be addressed with regard to the new positions, which were created in 2004. They include 17 Correction Officer promotions and three Deputy Sheriff promotions. BRO has recommended that the 2005 Budget include these positions, but it is of concern whether or not the backfills will be funded in 2005. Since the three Deputy Sheriff supervisory positions use the abolishment of three Deputy Sheriff I's as an offset, the Deputy Sheriff •• Deputy Sheriffs are not as impacted as the Correction Officers.

However, if we are unable to fill the backfill, the Deputy Sheriffs will not gain one Captain and two Sergeants. The results will be a gain of one Captain, a loss of one Lieutenant and a gain of only one Sergeant. On the other hand, since the Correction Officers did not use positions as an offset, and even if the 17 positions are not permitted to be back filled, the Correction Officers will not gain a Captain, three Lieutenants and 13 sergeants. In actuality, they will gain one Captain, two Lieutenants, not three, nine Sergeants, not 13, and we will lose 13 entry level Correction Officer I positions. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Legislature ensure that all back fill funding is in place.

With regard to the chronic overtime problem in the Sheriff's Office, the County Executive is requesting that the Legislature and the Comptroller assign appropriate representatives to a joint task force made up of the staff in the Budget Review Office, auditors from the Comptroller's

Office and staff in the County Executive's Office of Budget and Management to work with the Sheriff in reviewing the operations of the Sheriff's Office and make recommendations for civilianization and for ways to reduce overtime.

By creating 20 Deputy Sheriff positions, 50 Correction Officer positions and eight civilian positions, the 2005 recommended budget already acknowledges the fact that the best way to decrease overtime is to higher additional staff. It should be noted that Correction Officer overtime was already examined by the State Comptroller's Office with a final report submitted on May 21st, 2004. The period covered in the examination was from January 1st, 2002, through March 21st, 2003. This examination took approximately one year to complete. The auditor's results are quotes follows, "We determine that the County could have saved as much as 2.4 million in payroll cost over a three period if an additional 90 Correction Officers had been hired in 2003. The lack of a sufficient number of Correction Officers to staff the correctional facilities resulted in a reliance on overtime to provide adequate security and control over the inmates.

Overtime for Correction Officers in 2002 amounted to approximately \$10.6 million or 10% of the cost of operating the County's correctional facilities. I'm sorry, with regard to the savings, it was 4.2. I would like now to have Chief of Staff Alan Otto discuss the remaining concerns.

CHIEF OTTO:

The next concern that we want to address is overtime. Your year end overtime estimates for this year is \$18.9 million. It's \$600,000 over the adopted amount. However, this takes into a high projection for our four quarter compensation reimbursement. There were three unanticipated actions that occurred this year that increased our overtime by approximately 1.3 million. However another unanticipated action, the closing of the dormitories, four north and four south actually saved a degree of overtime by eliminating eight security posts daily. This would play a major roll in offsetting the estimated overtime deficit.

The first and main reason for the additional overtime cost is the 2003 Arbitration Award for Correction Officers. This reduced the previous 80 work week devisor to 75 hours. This translates a 6.7% increase in overtime pay for Correction Officers. This increased cost of overtime, due to the arbitration award, was not factored into anyone's budget or anyone's budget analysis. It occurred after our budget was submitted and adopted. This alone drove up the year end overtime by an estimated \$800,000.

Next, while we did forewarn the County that transportation costs would increase if we were required to send prisoners to substitute jails, we did not anticipate the degree to which this would occur. Therefore, the need to transfer even more inmates to substitute jails has also increased the amount of Deputy Sheriff overtime by at least \$400,000. The last main reason why the year end estimate overtime is higher than the adopted amount is the security we provided at the US Golf Open. This also was not considered at the time of our budget preparation and is estimated at \$150,000.

BRO believes that the additional officers that became part of the work force •• that will become part of the work force in 2005, overtime should be decreased by approximately 11%. The Sheriff's Office concurs that as long as no catastrophic events occur, the overtime budget for 2005 will be reduced to approximately 16 million or over two million less than 2004.

Next category is vehicles. This year as well as the recent past, the Sheriff's Office vehicle request has been removed from our Operating Budget and placed in the Department of Public Work's budget. This as previously stated, is inefficient and has caused a lag vehicle budget. I went on the record personally last year and advised everyone that is here that this is exactly what I suspect would occur and has in fact occurred. When the Sheriff's Office had the vehicles assigned to our Operating Budget, we were able to order our vehicles in either January or early February. These vehicles would arrive around June or July and become part of the fleet. As of this morning, the Sheriff's Office has received only five vehicles for 2004. These vehicles were received last Friday.

More importantly, other vehicles, which we were supposed to receive in 2004, we may not receive at all this year. While we may still receive some of our 2004 vehicles in later 2005, the steady and deliberate lagging of our vehicle purchase would destroy the quality and safety of Sheriff's Office's fleet. This is a serious issue. And every year this continues, our vehicle fleet will adversely affected. Is it, therefore, requested that the funding for any vehicles for the Sheriff's Office remain in the Sheriff's Operating Budget. The Sheriff needs to place orders for his vehicles as early as possible in the year so that the vehicles can arrive as early as possible.

When we have vehicles logging over 6000 miles per month, we cannot afford to wait to replace them. Operational efficiency as well as safety is adversely affected when we lag our vehicle

purchases. The vehicles which we have received in the winter months, like this month, most have all the electrical work, painting, etcetera, completed in less than desirable conditions. The main reason for this, the Sheriff's Office only one has one vehicle a day in which to complete all this work.

The County did not approve the Sheriff's Office's request for unmarked vehicles in 2004. Once again, no unmarked vehicles have been approved in the recommended 2005 budget. This is just plain ridiculous. Our unmarked vehicles are falling apart. County Fleet Services is fully aware of our situation. BRO has identified this concern and suggests that the Sheriff provide DPW with a prioritized list of vehicles which need to be replaced with available funds. However, last year when we tried to do this, DPW refused to order unmarked vehicles for the Sheriff's Office, because, and I quote, they were not approved in the budget, unquote. No one other than the Sheriff's Office and the vehicle maintenance section knows exactly what is needed in order to function. This problem would be totally alleviated if the funding for the purchase of these vehicles remained in the Sheriff's Operating Budget. Next category is equipment and supplies.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Excuse me, before you go on to the next topic. Jim, I'm going to ask you comment on that, because you did highlight in your report that the operation that they have for maintaining their vehicles is more cost effective and efficient than what is happening with the rest of the County's fleet. So it seems to me that if they're maintaining and servicing their vehicles, that it might be a better way to approach this •• is to let them •• you know, whatever dollar amount is decided that they're going to have the vehicles, to let them just handle the whole, you know, process themselves. Can you comment on it?

MR. SPERO:

Yeah. The Sheriff's Department •• because inmate labor is able to run the garage very cost effectively, and we have noted this issue for a number of years, it's been the case for many years, when County Fleet was consolidated some years back, we recommended that the Sheriff's part of that not be consolidated, and I believe the Legislature reversed that consolidation as far as the Sheriff was concerned. As far as the purchase of vehicles, right now it's all centralized in DPW. If the Legislature wishes to transfer the funding for the vehicles to the Sheriff's Department, the Sheriff can then set the priorities as to what vehicles and the type of vehicles that would be purchased and wouldn't be held captive to whatever the County Exec

or DPW wants to purchase for the Sheriff's Office. So that would be a policy decision. There's no cost impact other than transferring the funds from one appropriation to another.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Was there a time •• did you say that there was a time that this was done that way, and if so, when?

CHIEF OTTO:

Yes. I became Chief of Staff in 1997, and for a few years, we had in that in our budget, the full funding. As a matter of fact, working closely with Fleet Services, we were able to streamline our fleet, I think we turned in, like, 40 vehicles that we didn't want, and then we were able to upgrade the vehicles over the years. And then I believe it was approximately maybe five years ago that we had the funding removed from our budget.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Can I just ask a question?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Sure, Bill. Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

And you can do that with the existing administrative staff you have?

CHIEF OTTO:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

I'm sorry, did you get your question answered?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. Continue then. Thank you.

CHIEF OTTO:

Okay. The next area I'd like to cover is the equipment and supplies section. In our budget requests, the supplies and equipment accounts were requested to be substantially increased. The main reason for this is that three of our sections or bureaus are relocating to new or expanding buildings next year. Since the 5•25•5 is funding no longer available and this equipment does not qualify for capital funding, we were advised by the Department of Public Works that all necessary furniture and equipment for these three new facilities must be included in our Operating Budget request. First, our civil bureau is relocating to the old infirmary which is currently under renovation. It should be noted that we held off purchasing, finishings and furnishings for the civil bureau in the recent past in anticipation for this relocation. We should be moving into the civil bureau some time next month •• correction, November of '05.

The DWI Alternative Program is going to be moving to a new and expanded facility. Consequently, a great deal of the present furnishings is beyond its useful life and must be replaced. BRO recommends that the nonmandated portions of the 2005 budget for equipment should be increased by \$50,000. This will provide the necessary items needed in the new facilities and to maintain and expand operating efficiencies. The Sheriff's Office is requested that \$20,000 be added to Appropriation 3110•2010, \$10,000 be added to Appropriation 3110•2020, and \$20,000 be added to 3110•2500. This would be in compliance with BRO's recommendations. And again, the DWI building should be opening in October of '05.

Third building is the quartermaster section. We're going to a large •• move a large portion of this operation to the new warehouse that is currently going to be shared with the Police Department. BRO recommends that the mandated portion of the budget be increased by \$100,000. A large portion of that amount will go for purchase of new furniture and equipment necessary in the new warehouse. Therefore, we agree with BRO's recommendation that the mandated portion of the budget be increased for \$100,000 for equipment. And again, that completion or that move should occur probably early January of next year.

BRO recommends that an additional \$68,000 be included in the 2005 budget to purchase police radios for additional vehicles added to the fleet with the creation of twenty new Deputy Sheriffs. We fully concur with this recommendation and request that \$68,000 be added to appropriation 3110•2260. In addition, additional funding should also be moved into our Operating Budget to cover the cost for the mobile data terminals for these new units. The

Sheriff's Office agrees also be BRO's recommendation that an additional \$410,000 be added to subobject 3310 in appropriation 3150, clothing accessories for replacements of vests for Correction Officers. The Sheriff's Office worked closely with BRO for the appropriations that will fully receive these funds. In preparation of our 2005 budget, we contacted the County MIS regarding ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Alan, excuse me. A question on the vests. I would assume that you had requested that funding?

CHIEF OTTO:

We were •• after we had submitted our budget request, okay, we analyzed our figures and we left that out. We had contacted BRO and brought it to their attention.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. Thank you.

CHIEF OTTO:

And finally, in preparation of our 2005 budget, we contacted with the County MIS section regarding our computer requests for the next budget cycle. The County MIS section not only gave us their recommendation, but gave us strict guidelines for replacement of our computer equipment. The Sheriff's Office then did an extensive inventory of all computer equipment, and our budget request reflects our requirements. Not only did the County Executive not approve any new equipment, but the replacement request based upon the County's own guidelines was drastically reduced. In closing, I'll turn this back over to the Sheriff.

SHERIFF TISCH:

Thank you. Before I make my closing comments, I would ask if there are any questions that the Legislators have for the staff. We'd by more than happy to answer them at this time.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. Does anyone have any questions or comments for the Sheriff or any of the people here? I guess not.

SHERIFF TISCH:

Thank you for your attention. On behalf of the office ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

It would be helpful though, I'd like to get a copy of the presentation.

CHIEF OTTO:

I'll have copies of everything for everyone.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay. Thank you.

SHERIFF TISCH:

I appreciate the opportunity to address this august body. I appreciate the support that you have constantly provided for your office since I became Sheriff. As you are aware, when I addressed this Legislative committee several months into my tenure as Sheriff in 2002, I gave you my considered opinion as to the state of the Sheriff's Office and found that we were woefully understaffed and that we were over tasked. I'm happy to report that with your support, we have been able to march into the 21st Century with our equipment and technology. Our short staffing has been addressed and is continuing to be addressed by this body as well as by the County Executive's Office.

In 2002, I indicated to you that I would never come to you and tell you what I wanted, only what I needed. I think our budget requests are in line with that credo, and we will continue to try to do more with less, but I do appreciate the fact that you understand that our tasks are expanding rapidly. The overcrowding in our correction facilities, loss of several of our dormitories have just exacerbated the situation. Nonetheless, we have been able to provide safe and secure facilities in spite of what we have had to face with regard to inadequate facilities. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you. And you and the rest of your staff have really been terrific advocates for the office, and there really has been a change over the past number of years, so thank you.

SHERIFF TISCH:

Thank you.

LEG. BISHOP:

I have a question.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

Sheriff.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Excuse me, Sheriff. Legislator Bishop was not here when you •• when we had offered the question time.

LEG. BISHOP:

Thank you. Good morning. Preceding your taking the Office of Sheriff, we have long had a problem with short staffing in your department and the driving up of overtime, and we have always as a Legislature attempted to address that and have not always found that the County Executive or the Sheriff himself has been willing to help, not you. What I want to know is last year when we did our omnibus, we added personnel, but we had a note that required that your office provide documentation that adding staff actually reduced the overtime burden so that we weren't, you know, continuing •• the rational always for adding staff was Sheriff needs new staff to drive down overtime. I'm not sure that that actually occurred.

SHERIFF TISCH:

We will certainly provide that to you, but what you have to understand, Legislator Bishop, is that those positions that you were kind enough to create are in training right now. We have a Deputy Sheriff class and a Correction Officer class, which are at the academies. They have not impacted our work force at all yet. They will be coming ••

LEG. BISHOP:

So in 2004, you didn't have any staff come on line?

SHERIFF TISCH:

Deputy sheriffs will be graduating November 30th, and our Correction Officers somewhat shortly thereafter. They will impact the operating costs in 2005, but clearly they have no impact this year.

LEG. BISHOP:

Okay. I don't recall, were there classes in 2003?

SHERIFF TISCH:

Yes, there were, but those were basically make up classes, they did not really add any additional officers.

LEG. BISHOP:

Okay. All right. Does Budget Review Office agree with that? Is that accurate from your perspective?

MR. SPERO:

Yes, that's accurate. And on page 387 of the report, you will see a chart of the overtime hours worked by the various units in the Sheriff's Office.

LEG. BISHOP:

But the •• the fundamental point that they can't draw the •• can't bring out the evidence yet that staff reduces overtime. We'll not •• we won't know that until next year?

MR. SPERO:

That's correct.

LEG. BISHOP:

Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you, gentlemen. Next we will hear from the Police Department. Commissioner Dormer and whomever you would like to bring up with you. And that's on page 319 •• it starts on 319 of the BRO report. Good morning, Commissioner, welcome to your first Operating Budget cycle.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Good morning, everybody. Thank you for the invitation.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Whenever you are ready to begin.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Okay. We will try to be brief, even though that may be difficult with a budget presentation. Everybody knows that we have had increased •• or as a recommendation, increased the '05 budget 8.3% or 31.5 million. Some reasons for this increase, just for the record, the raises in 2004 and what we anticipate in '05, 3.7 each year, 7.64 compounded. There will be a two million•one•three•five or 6.8 increase to fund retroactive pay for '04, step raises for police officers, detective and AME, A•M•E, and the increased termination pay for 34 civilianized sworn officers. In the '05 request, which you have seen, equipment and supplies were held at zero or even less over '04, with the following exceptions; soft body armor, that's the safety vest, there's a seven year replacement cycle which will begin in '05, \$372,000. We're required to do that. Aviation costs, additional flying, \$111,000. And it was a transfer from the Capital Budget into the Operating Budget of \$37,000 for painting, tower painting, the radio tower that we have to paint required by federal regulations and safety issues. The equipment and supply budget we can live with what we recommended and what's in the budget.

In '05, we recommend hiring 100 police officers. That's what's in the budget. I had asked 111 to recover the retirements. There's 100 recommended, I can live with that, 50 in March, 50 in October. It will keep us even with retirements, basically depending on what happens with our civilianization in '05. In 2005, I should mention, that eligible to retire with 20 years plus, 695; 27 years on the job, 55 years of age; 204. I just put that on the record to indicate how many people are eligible to retire in the police service. Civilianization, as you know, we have made a very strong effort, a continuous effort, to civilianize positions in the Police Department where we believe we don't need sworn officers. I'd like to give you these numbers, if I may.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

If I could just interrupt for a moment. On point, Legislator Losquadro had a question on civilianization.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yes. Since you are going to be bringing up figures related to that, I just wanted to ask, in going through the civilianization job title list, I can see many that I'm sure you can make a very strong case for, but I think I see four here in applicant investigation, and if you could give us explanation as to why we would remove applicant investigation from sworn duty officers those with the background to do the investigation, the research. These are people that are being hired. We pride ourselves on having, you know, an honorable very diligent force, and you know, it all starts with investigating the applicants to screen them and, you know, weed out those who aren't going to make the cut. So if you could address that along with the rest of the civilianization, I would appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Sure. We looked at that very carefully. It's a lot •• a lot of the applicant investigation work is paperwork on the computer, collecting information on background on the people who want to become police officers or want to be hired by the County, we do applicant investigation for a lot of people in Suffolk County, not just cops. So it was decided that if we have a balance in there, we can civilianize four positions, but still keep police officers in there to do the police officer part of that activity.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

How many titles are there in applicant investigations currently?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

One sergeant and 16 police officers, that being total, so we'll go to one and 12.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

So you'll be civilianizing only ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I'm sorry?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

You would only be civilianizing basically only a quarter of staff in there?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

The Chief just reminded me that two of them are going to applicant investigation and two to the pistol license section, that will be the four. But if you noticed the numbers, that's not a dramatic impact on that unit since it's a paperwork driven operation. You know, people •• and it's much like private business, by the way, when they do a personnel function.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

All right. Well, without knowing the staffing of department, I didn't know if there were four or six or 20 people in that department, so I just wanted to clarify, because I do think it is important to have sworn officers conducting, you know, the investigative portion of that job to make sure that we're doing the proper screening, getting the proper people for the job. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Thank you. The civilianization, we have recommended 15 detective positions, and these are crime analysis positions, generally. There's, I think, a police operations aide, transporting vehicles, making sure the vehicles are serviced. We have a detective doing that right now. It doesn't make sense, a high paid detective, we can have a police operations aide to do that, to have the ability to drive vehicles for repair, for inspection, transportation, that kind of thing, not police work. We also have a detective right now in fugitive who plans trips, out•of•state trips, to pick up fugitives, it can be done by a civilian, to arrange the airline tickets, that kind of thing.

Fifty one police officers, originally 53 at last, public information specialists would be civilianized. The 28 DARE Officers, if that ever works out, that's a total of 95 officers; six IT, that's the IT system, not actually civilianized, but would require sworn, a total of 101.

At this point in '04, our authorized civilian strength is 689. In '05, it would go to 741. The overtime budget. In '04, it was budgeted at 22 point •• 22,352. And '05, because of the increase in salaries, we kept it at the same hours, but the rate went up to 24 million•six, and that was because of the raises to our officers and civilians, which we anticipate in '05.

The items of interest that maybe need to be discussed is the •• replacing the 28 positions in DARE with part time or light duty officers. Vehicles, the unmarked vehicles, which is

undercover and unmarked have been cut by 50%. That's 40 vehicles, and that includes the unmarked vehicles and undercover vehicles.

Airport operations. In the budget, there's a recommendation that we remove •• that commencing next year, I remove from Mac Arthur Airport one sergeant and 17 police officers. This costs us over \$2 million without benefits a year. We do not receive any monies from Islip Town to police the airport. We feel that this is an expensive item. The taxpayers of Suffolk County are supplementing Islip operations at the airport. If we don't get reimbursement from Islip, we may have to redeploy these officers back into control do to what they were hired to do.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

But, Commissioner, excuse me a moment. I believe Legislator O'Leary had a comment.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Good morning, Commissioner. I have ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Good morning.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I actually have two comments. I want to focus on two specific areas which you have made mention of already in your report. Before we get to the two areas, in your opening statement, you mentioned something about monies to increase 34 civilianized sworn officers, what is a civilianized sworn officer?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. No. I have may have misspoke. The officers are going to be •• the positions are going to be civilianized. I'm sorry.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I thought ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. They're not civilian officers.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I though perhaps there was a new title, a civilianized sworn officer. There's not? Okay.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Not yet.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right. The two areas I want to focus on; DARE and the airport security. With respect to DARE, my understanding of the proposal of the County Executive is to take retired police officers and put them in that function, to perform the function of DARE; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes, that's the recommendation.

LEG. O'LEARY:

How does •• how does he or how would you propose to do that?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, we're canvassing retired officers as we speak to find out what interest we have out there, who would want to come back to do this function. You have to have volunteers under the DARE Program, they have to be volunteers. And we are waiting that now as we speak. I don't know if anybody has responded, but we're reaching out by letter and through the organization newsletters.

LEG. O'LEARY:

And who is it that you're reaching out to, sir?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Retired officers.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All retired officers?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes. We're going to include all retired officers, not just DARE retired officers. There are only seven DARE officers that have retired over the years, because most of the people who do this job are young officers, so they're still on the job. I was surprised myself when I found out it was only seven, because we've had DARE for a while. So we're waiting for the results of that, then we would have to interview them and find out if they are, you know, the type of people that we would want doing this. Well, we'd have to find out their interests and, you know, would they fit into the DARE Program.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Okay. You had mentioned that it was voluntary.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, if we sent out letters, and they send in a letter to us telling us they would like to do it, they're volunteering.

LEG. O'LEARY:

So in effect, what the County Executive is proposing and apparently is you're being supportive of is the police officers will no longer be involved in the DARE Program?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, they would be retired police officers. Our officers in Suffolk County, the officers that are in the schools today, other than some sergeants that now run DARE, they would still be supervising the program, but the people that are in the schools would be replaced by either light duty officers, who would be sworn officers or retired officers.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Can we agree, sir, that retired police officers are no longer police officers?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes. They are civilians.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Okay. So in effect, my statement just prior to your response is accurate, that what is being proposed is that civilians run the DARE Program?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes, civilian retired officers, yeah. Retired officers who are now civilians.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Sir, forget the retired status.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, we can't forget that, because that's one of the requirements of DARE, that there be police background involved in this. So we're just not going to hire civilians, they have to be police.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Okay. One of the other concerns ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Can I just interrupt a moment, please?

LEG. O'LEARY:

Sure.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Just on this one point. I want to make sure I understood what you were saying. These letters are going out to retired police officers, and they're being asked if they're interested volunteering to be DARE officers, to be in the classroom teaching the DARE, curriculum volunteering, no pay?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. No. We've made recommendations that they get paid \$25 an hour, that's the rate of pay that we're recommending •• that I recommended.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

So they're not a volunteer then, you are paying them.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah, but you have to •• you have to want the job. You know, it's, like, reaching out to them, do you want to do this? Yes. We pay you \$25 an hour if you do it.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

It's not like in the police business where we transfer somebody into a unit, and we say, this is what you are going to do. They don't volunteer for it. But in the DARE Program, people volunteer to do DARE. They just say I'd like to do it, and the same thing with the retirees. We don't want somebody that doesn't want to do it, obviously.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I think perhaps a better classification rather than volunteering these retired officers is recruiting these retired officers, because, in effect, that's what you're doing, are you not?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, yeah. Well, we're trying to make this more efficient. If we can do it with retired officers and light duty officers in the Police Department, I can put 28 full duty police officers back in patrol. That's the theory here, that we can utilize ••

LEG. O'LEARY:

Then I will segue into my next question. These 28 officers that currently perform the DARE function, where are they currently assigned?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

They're assigned to the COPE Units in the precincts.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right. And the COPE Units, in effect, are assigned to patrol •• the patrol function, more or less a selective type of enforcement, a special enforcement type of functions, they don't handle the day•to•day calls that are generated by the citizenry to the Police Department for response, correct?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Generally they don't, but they are a back up on the streets, they do assist the cops, and they do pick up the calls from •• emergency calls.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Right. And the 28 officers that are assigned to COPE who also perform the DARE, when they're not performing the DARE function, what are they doing?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

They're back in the COPE Unit then. That's usually during the summers when the school is closed. And also, I should •• I should mention that that's when they take their vacations and time off, because they can't take it during the school year, they're doing lesson plans. There's a lot of work involved with the DARE Program. The point is that they do give some quality time to COPE, but there is a •• are we getting everything on the street from them? No. They're doing DARE, which we think is important, by the way. I don't want to say that DARE •• I don't think DARE is not an important program, but I think we're locked into DARE right now with full duty police officers, 28 of them, which is an expensive proposition at this stage.

Notwithstanding all the studies that say that DARE is really not working. We would like, and I think the County Executive proposed that we go in a different direction with gangs and tobacco and other issues related to our youth that wouldn't lock us into the DARE Program so we would have more flexibility with our police officers. We would like •• we are not saying we want to get rid of DARE. We would like to see if there's another way of doing it. That's what we're looking at right now, and that's what the proposal is.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Have either you, our office, or the Executive Office, if you're aware of it, been in contact with DARE of America with respect to this proposal?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes. Yes, we have contacted them, and retired police officers can do the job. They told us that that's fine.

LEG. O'LEARY:

And these retired police officers who are, in fact, civilians, let's get that straight, if you're a retired police officer, your status is that of a civilian, you are not a sworn police officer. We

agree on that, correct?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. No. We agree on that. Anybody that's retired from the police service is a civilian, is the status of civilian.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right. Are you aware of any constraints of placing civilians in police uniforms?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. I've researched that, and we have a history, as you know, I'm sure, that we have in history in Suffolk County of civilians wearing police uniforms. The auxiliaries have done this so many years, when I came on the job a long time ago, auxiliaries Suffolk County Police uniforms, which we gave them. The only difference was that they had a patch on the shoulder that said, "Auxiliary Police", "Huntington", "Islip." We would anticipate that we would do the same thing with DARE. It would say DARE •• "Suffolk County DARE." I don't see •• I don't see a major issue with that.

LEG. O'LEARY:

It would not in any way indicate that these individuals are police officers?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. Just like auxiliary are not known as police officers, they're auxiliaries, civilians. And they actually carry a weapon, the auxiliaries.

LEG. O'LEARY:

But the auxiliary uniform does say police on it.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Auxiliary police.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yes. But the DARE Officers that you're proposing ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. I wouldn't make it police. My understanding, I'm not sure now, that DARE would require the patch to say police, but we would look at it as Suffolk County DARE. I would have to research the issue of Suffolk County Police DARE. Again, if the auxiliaries can do it, I see no reason why •• and they're civilians, by the way, just like our retired police officers, and I see no problem with the uniform. I don't think that's the big issue that I have at this point. My problem is getting people qualified to do this job.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Well, that was my next question. In the event that you are unable to •• well, let me backtrack a little bit. Is the your opinion that 28 bodies are necessary to compliment the DARE Program in order to fulfill the obligations?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah. We would look at 28 or we might have some reserves of 30, 35 people, if we can do that. You know, we have 28 doing it right now in the police service. Somebody calls out sick, the school district manages with the person out. So we would do the same thing.

LEG. O'LEARY:

In the event that you are unable to get a minimum amount of personal for purposes of this function, do you have any alternative plans?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, we're looking at light duty officers in the department to see if it would be feasible to put them in the there and relieve the full duty officers for the street. That's what we're looking at, that's why we mentioned either retired or light duty officers.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Okay. And finally on this particular point, the DARE issue, are you aware of a concept called, "Unit Work"?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Are you aware that currently the functions of this particular program are being performed by sworn police officers?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Are you also aware that there's a distinct possibility that if those functions are taken away from the current police officers who are part of the Bargaining Unit, that you may very well have a PERB action?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

You know, that wouldn't surprise me, because we have one working right now with the desk situation in the precincts where •• that's in PERB, and we have to wait for that to come down. We have a history in the Police Department for many years right up to the present of replacing officers with civilians, our civilianization program is part of that. So •• I mean, I guess they could go to PERB on the civilianization of these positions. We'll just have to address that if it happens.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Okay. Do any of my colleagues have any more questions on the DARE Program before I go to airport security?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Commissioner, do you think it might be premature to go forward with this? I mean, if the County Executive's proposal is approved as is, I mean, you don't have the retirees lined up, there's going to be •• there has to be some training, you just can't take a retiree and put them in the classroom. Wouldn't you prefer to have a little •• a little lead time, maybe consider this for next year's budget rather than this year? I mean, the classes, the DARE classes, if I'm not mistaken, usually start in the winter months. So you don't have much of a time frame here to prepare for this.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

That's correct.

LEG. LINDSAY:

And a couple of years ago, we had a Commissioner that wanted to eliminated DARE, and, God, we had a revolution here. You know, in spite of all the studies, the parents of the kids are convinced that DARE works. You know, I've seen some of •• you know, I go to a lot of the graduatations, and there's an absolute belief by the community that DARE works.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

That's why we didn't say eliminate DARE. We're well aware of that. I mean, I'm, well aware of that. I've talked to the County Executive about it, and, you know, we don't want to •• we don't want to hurt the kids, we don't want to hurt the parents. We want to do to what's right. But, again, we have to look at the fiscal end of this thing, of course. You know, were we're trying to balance this thing, we're trying to balance it out. We're going to do it responsibly, by the way. I mean, it's not going to be throwing people into the classroom, and it will be a disaster. We're not going to do that. We're going to make sure it works right if we can make it work. Again, we're just in the infant stage of this thing.

LEG. LINDSAY:

But that's my point. If we approve this now, truthfully, I don't think you have enough time to put this together and meet the schedule of the schools.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

It's going to be pretty tight, I would say that.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

On the broader topic of civilianization and personnel, how many sworn police officers are there in Suffolk County currently?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

It's 2691. The Chief has this stuff in his head all the time. That's what he deals with.

LEG. BISHOP:

And how many do you need?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, looking at our strength right now, where we are right now, and hiring the hundred •• I asked for 111 for next year, but I can live with 100, and we keep pace with the retirements, we are going to be okay for next year. If we do what we have asked for in the budget, we are going to be okay. And I think that this staffing issue has to be looked at every year. It's a yearly thing, because the dynamics of the policing business change so quickly, that you can't get fixed into numbers, because it changes. That's why it has to be evaluated very closely when you make up your Operating Budget, and we did this this year. Based on the retirements, I recommend, and I've recommended to the Executive Branch, that we plan for hiring to replace retirees every year. It should be based on, again, if need them, but we don't do that.

LEG. BISHOP:

How many do you expect to retire?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, it depends on the civilianization effort that we have going forward. It could be as high as but, that depends on the civilianization that we •• we anticipate that some of the civilianized positions, the officers may decide to leave rather than go back to patrol. And one of the efforts we did this year during the summer was put these cops back on the street for a week to give them an idea of what it was like out there, to make them comfortable with the street. They may not retire. They may find out that I can do this job again.

So I can't give you firm numbers, but every year approximately 105 to 110 people leave the police service. We recommend that we should schedule at least to replace the retirees, unless something comes up where we need more people or we need less. I should remind everybody when we look at this staffing issue, which is in the hot burner right now, New York City PD had 44,000 cops ten years ago. They have 33,000 today as we speak, and they are doing a fine job in New York City. So things change in the business. And we shouldn't keep throwing numbers

as police problems. We should manage what we have very carefully, manage them carefully to respond to the issues. And then if we do need cops, be able to come forward and say, we need 50, we need 100, but be able to defend that request. I think that's being fiscally responsible. And I think we did that in this budget. I didn't ask for 400 cops, 200. I asked for 50 •• 100 •• actually 1111, I said I could do the job with 111 this year •• I mean, '05.

LEG. BISHOP:

Well, understanding that I shouldn't obsess on numbers, just to understand the numbers, you're anticipating 130 retirements ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

It's projected, yeah.

LEG. BISHOP:

Projected. But you're asking for 100 new officers, and you hope to make up with the difference with civilianization, is that essentially what this proposal is?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah. The civilianization •• we hope we are going to be aggressive in this in '05. We're getting the SCIN forms signed, the County Executive has committed to this civilianization process where we bring civilians into the service and cops go back out on the street.

LEG. BISHOP:

Okay. Then just give me a profile of •• you know, I'm worried, I can't have too many Pete O'Learys in this world, so how many detectives •• no, that was a joke.

LEG. O'LEARY:

That's a joke?

LEG. BISHOP:

Yes.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Okay. I would hope so.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

He doesn't look like he is laughing.

LEG. BISHOP:

I'm sorry. He's very serious today.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

What is civilianization in detectives?

LEG. BISHOP:

No. What I'm trying to get at is are we making a lot of detectives this year and next year and do we have •• are we going to be top heavy?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. No. The detectives •• we the Detective Division was down substantially when we came on board. They created •• we wanted to create new units, gang units. They weren't really properly manned; identified theft, major crimes unit, you have heard all these units, that we put in place, by the way, we had the ability to put them in place, but a lot of detectives had retired over the last couple of years.

Now, you should also remember that the last group of detectives that were promoted under the past administration, a number of them went to the District Attorney's Squad, they didn't stay in the police service, okay? So we had to make sure that our detectives, detective squads, are properly functioning to respond to the serious offences. We want people, our citizens, who are burglarized, who are assaulted, raped, murdered to get proper and effective responses. We want these bad buys brought in. And by the way, the clearance rate, the arrest rate, in Suffolk County and the crime rate, all the other rates are up and the crime rate is down. Everybody knows that, but it's for a reason, and we don't want to let it get away from us.

If we have a serious crime that is not handled properly, okay, we are not serving our citizens. We must pay attention to •• and identity theft was one of them. You know, it's now becoming the vogue. After we did it, Nassau County created a unit, and New York City is now asking us how did you do this. New York City who is usually ahead of everybody in this game. So the things we are doing are very critical, but we've done it very efficiently, I should say. The patrol

force is okay right now. We can do it with the overtime. The overtime that's budgeted for this year and that we requested next year is to make sure that we keep our patrol services up.

LEG. BISHOP:

So the point of that is that we have more detectives, but we need them or that we're just ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. What we have right now is adequate. We're fine right now, the detectives.

LEG. BISHOP:

All right. But let's say two years ago, did we have more or less detectives?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. Two years ago, I'm not •• I don't •• I don't know how many they had two years ago. But a lot of detectives •• how many detectives retired?

LEG. BISHOP:

Maybe BRO can answer it.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I don't know, 30, 40 detectives retire in a year. These are •• by the way, the detectives usually are the older officers. They've been in the police service for 30 years, so they retire. You know, so the turnover in the Detective Division •• and, you know, we have to plan for that, as you know, and train the people that come in. You just don't go into the Detective Division overnight and become a detective. It takes time. It's a complicated job.

LEG. BISHOP:

Nobody can give me the profile of what I'm asking? All right. I'll get it later on.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

If you talk to the President of the Detectives Association, he would tell you he's down 60 detectives from his table of organization, but he's not going to get these 60 detectives. We're going to manage with what we have, because we think we can do the job with what we have. And I think that's the way to do it. That's what I'm committed to, the efficient use of the

people that I have.

LEG. BISHOP:

Just finally, what are the crime statistics that you •• what's the last period you have statistics for?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, in September, you know, please bear with me, I could be off a few percentages, but violent crime is down in the double digits, it's 10 point something percent down over the month before. It's down about eight or 9% over the year. Property crime is down about 8% over the year.

LEG. BISHOP:

That's comparing year to year? That's comparing 2004 to 2003.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes. Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

And, of course, since about 1993, we've had a decline almost every year.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Right. Right. And this by the way, this is one of the reasons that •• you know, because of violent crime being down, we can now deploy our officers in a different manner. There are different types of crimes today then there was in the '70s and '80s when we had to crack epidemic on the streets. Right now, it's gangs. This is the •• the buzz word today is gangs, but that's not just what we do. You know, identity theft is the hidden crime. Domestic violence is still a major issue in Suffolk County. We have to make sure we have the resources to handle that. And, of course, you know, if your house is burglarized, you don't want to hear that the crime rate is down. That doesn't really help you. You want that burglary solved. That's very personal. And we •• we buy into that when we talk •• when we hire detectives, that that burglary is solved, that the larceny is solved, the identity theft is solved, so that people can go about their business in peace without worrying about this kind of stuff.

So we had to put these detectives in that we just put in. And, as you know, I had to go defend

this before the Executive Branch. It wasn't like we transferred them in, and then six months later they're made by law. We went to the County Executive right up front and said, this is what we need, this is why we need them, we justified them by the numbers, and he signed the SCINs right there before we transferred them, never done before. It's completely different. Rather than, under old administrations, people would be transferred into the Detective Division, the Executive Branch wouldn't know about it because there were no SCINs signed, and six months later, you had to sign them. And the budget •• the Budget Office •• Budget should be involved any time you promote people into positions where you're going to give them a raise. We should make sure we have the money and the impact on the budget. So we decided to do it that way, we think it's the professional way to do it.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Bishop is done. All right. We were staying on the DARE topic before we moved into something else, and I just wanted to state for the record that I support Legislator Lindsay's position. I think before we move forward with making a major change, you really need to have everything solidified. When did the letters go out?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

About a month ago. About a month ago, yeah.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

And have you received any responses?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

The Chief says not yet, but somebody mentioned to me that one person did respond, and I had somebody call me. So it wasn't a terrific response, but that was only to seven people, the retired DARE, then I directed that we contact all retirees, make the pool bigger, larger.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Am I going to get a letter?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I will probably get one. Well, we want people that are qualified to do this job. No, I'm talking about myself.

LEG. O'LEARY:

So that excludes both of us.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. I'm talking about myself.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I understand.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

To that point, I just think, and you said it, it takes a special kind of person, it's going to take training, there is a school year involved, so I think until it is all put in place, and you can demonstrate that you do have a viable plan, to go ahead and effectuate this now within the budget process, I think, would be a little bit premature. I was happy to hear you state how important it is to constantly be looking at staffing levels, because in doing so, in my mind, you have validated the staffing task force, so I think you for that. Legislator o'Leary.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I don't remember saying that.

LEG. CARPENTER:

You did. I wrote it down. You did.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I gave you my philosophy and opinion on the staffing.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Let's just go back to DARE just for just a second. How does one •• how does one who is a retired police officer qualify to be part of the DARE Program? What are the qualifications?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

For the DARE Program?

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, they have to have an interest in doing this. You know, do you have a specific point that you are going to do something specific?

LEG. O'LEARY:

Well, clearly, we clarified that you and I as retirees are not eligible or not qualified.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, we could be trained. You and I could go Upstate and be trained.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I see. So there's going to be a training process involved?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes. There is a training process in involved.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I would hope so, because coming in cold, if they've never ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. No. It's required under the program that they be trained.

LEG. O'LEARY:

So is the only prerequisite that the individual be a retired police officer?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

You mean from DARE?

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yes. To work in the DARE Program.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

They have to be in uniform. But do you have a specific point?

LEG. O'LEARY:

The point I'm trying to make or ask or determine is what qualifications are you going to put into place for a retired police officer to work the DARE Program?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

They will be selected, trained, uniformed.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right. Well, is there a cost.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I'm sorry?

LEG. O'LEARY:

Will there be a cost associated with the training?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

How much?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

We will pay for that.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

How much?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I don't know how much it is. I think it's two weeks of training. They do it Upstate, or •• so I don't know what it cost, but we would •• we would pay for it.

LEG. O'LEARY:

But my question is initially, you reached out to the seven retirees from DARE, so obviously, they have the experience and require little training. So is the only prerequisite in this recruitment process is that an individual be a retired police officer, then you will train them?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

You flow, we visit with DARE and make sure that that would fit that criteria. Unless you know something that •• if there was any other retirements •• by the way, DARE does give exemptions for certain •• certain, you know, requirements, but I would address that if it comes to that. We haven't got to that stage yet. I wish I had all these retired officers that I had to worry about that issue with.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I'll defer to my colleague, Legislator Nowick who wishes to ••

LEG. NOWICK:

I just want to comment, and I'm afraid I might be going to muddy murky waters, here not to insult any of the retired policemen, because certainly I am within their age group, but it seems to me having been to many DARE Programs, having seen my own children years ago going through it that one of the thoughts might be I think that the young children can relate to, how can I put this gingerly, younger retired police officers. I don't mean •• I think that that is something that should be looked at. I see that in most of the DARE programs now that I go to, and I watch the young children, and I believe that they can relate to that age group rather than I'm seeing here the more aged, finer seasoned vintaged retirees, and I think that's something that should be considered, because if the program is to work at all, I think we have to remember what the kids are feeling. So that's something I think you have to consider.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Thank you.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Can one make that same argument for teachers? Younger teachers relate better than?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

All right. Legislator O'Leary, continue.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Now, finally, the airport security issue. What logic or reasoning was put into the place for taking the law enforcement presence away from Mac Arthur Airport?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Again, again, we're looking at fiscal efficiency here without diminishing the safety of people at the airport. We have 18 •• we have 18 officers at the airport doing perimeter patrol, by the way, that's mostly what they do, and I believe there's a sergeant and 18 officers. That's a big commitment to a private enterprise. We feel that we should get reimbursed from Islip Town for the cost of these officers, over \$2 million a year. The County Executive has attempted to get these monies and has not received any response back from the Supervisor Islip. We've attempted to work this out. Again, it's an expensive proposition. It's 18 •• 19 people that I can utilize in patrol. Where a peace officer can do the same function if Islip wants to do it that way without diminishing any safety. We're not going to diminish the safety of the people. We think it's the right way to do it.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I think that's the question that is most pressing, is we are of the opinion that based on recent legislation on the federal level that a law enforcement presence must be at all airports where there are commercial flights, and certainly Islip, Mac Arthur qualifies as an airport that handles commercial flights. And by definition, the TSA has defined a law enforcement personnel basically as police officers.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

My understanding is that they have police powers within the airport, and the Islip peace officers have police powers within the airport under New York State Law. The federal regulation, again, my understanding is it doesn't say police officer, it says police powers, which they have. Islip •
• Islip Town Peace Officers make arrests within the terminal under New York Law. They're authorized to do that, and that satisfies the federal requirement.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Can they effect an arrest with or without a warrant?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, the issue comes up •• with a warrant. Under New York State Law, peace officers do not have the authority to execute a warrant arrest. We have •• we subscribe that we're available to respond to execute that warrant arrest. We can respond like we respond to any entity that calls and says we have a person here that has an active warrant, come down and get them, and that's what we'll do. We respond. We •• Suffolk County did that for some time. The Fifth Precinct responded •• or Special Patrol responded if they had that one warrant arrest per year. I think that that's really not an issue that we can't overcome. We can respond to execute that warrant. Islip Town does the police function within the airport, they make asset seizures, which, by the way, Suffolk County Police do not get a part of. They get it. Not that I have any problem with that, but we have 18 •• 19 people down there doing perimeter •• mostly perimeter patrol around the airport. That's a cost to the taxpayers in Suffolk County, it's a hit on my budget, and I feel that unless we get reimbursed from Islip, I can utilize them on the streets of Suffolk County, maybe in addressing the gang problem.

LEG. O'LEARY:

So it's a question of reimbursement?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah. We would like to get reimbursed, yeah. If you can do that, that would be great.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right. And is it also your opinion that the Islip Town Public Safety Officers have peace officer status and qualify under the Anti Terrorism Preparedness Act of 2004?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah. My understanding is that they do, that they have police powers, which is what the Feds require, within the airport. And peace officers are like police officers where they work. They just don't carry it outside that facility. It's like a court officer in District Court, they're peace officers under New York State Law, but they are police. They have police powers within the court jurisdiction.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right. Just one final point. So in other words, if there was a reimbursement process in place, whether it be from the Town or the Federal Government, then you and the executive

would have no problem with having a law enforcement presence at Islip Mac Arthur Airport?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

That's my understanding.

LEG. O'LEARY:

So it's a question of money, not safety.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah, it's money. Money is a big issue, but we are just preparing right now to train 15 more peace officers for Islip Town. We do that in our Police Academy. And we are preparing •• they're preparing to put 15 people in. They're increasing their force at the airport, so it's growing.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

And usage at the airport is growing.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:

And, you know, you stated that it was a matter of money. The five western towns are in the Police District, and the five western towns of which Islip is one is where the airport is. And the taxes that are generated from your budget •• for your budget come from the western towns, and I for one would resent turning around and asking those taxpayers to have to pay even more to reimburse for what they should be able to expect, and that's public safety and protection. And in this time of enhanced security and areas that have been perceived or projected to be targets of terrorism, I don't see how we would want to diminish our presence at an airport, rather, I think, we should be looking at these areas as those that deserves the

attention of the Police Department in the Police District. And it's not just the residents of Islip that use that airport, certainly residents from throughout Suffolk County and the region come to Islip Mac Arthur Airport and have every reason to expect their safety to be insured.

I have a question for Budget Review, because I know that doing some of the research and the analysis for the report, that there were some conversations with TSA about this very issue, and I'm not sure, Jim or which of the two Jims, has that information and can share with us.

MR. SPERO:

Well, we did have conversations with the TSA on a number of occasions vis a vis airport security, not only in regards to Mac Arthur, but in the case of Gabreski Airport as well, and day we got a call from a fellow from the TSA, I keep forgetting his name, Jim _Modica_, and he was rather upset upon learning that the County Police might be pulled out of Mac Arthur Airport. And while we assured him that decision had not been made yet, he didn't seem too pleased with it. The bottom line at this point is that the TSA apparently can mandate a level of security at the airport and may mandate that the County retain Suffolk County Police at the airport, if, in fact, they were pulled out. But at this point in time, that's conjecture. We're not sure how TSA will react if the police are pulled out.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you. Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

Commissioner, who provides the security at Lagueardia and JFK, is it New York City Police or Port Authority Police?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I believe it's Port Authority.

LEG. BISHOP:

Right. And who operates JFK and Lagueardia? Port Authority.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Port Authority, I guess. A private entity, yeah.

LEG. BISHOP:

The Islip Force that's there, they are not police officers, what are they? What are they allowed to do? Are they more than Auxiliary Police Officers?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

They're peace officers. Under New York State Law, they're just like cops where they work. The only difference between a police officer and a peace officer is the jurisdiction or their area of responsibility; for example, a court officer in Suffolk County is a peace officer, they are police officers where they work, in the court. The minute they leave the parking lot, they become civilians.

LEG. BISHOP:

If they •• a terrorist, a lunatic, somebody who meant harm to passengers was in the airport was in the attempting to board the plane, could the Islip Force stop them without the assistance of Suffolk County Police?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes. They are trained to do that. In fact, they do that right now as we speak. Our officers only recently have been allowed back into the terminal at the airport. They are perimeter patrol outside. We •• of course this was brought to my attention, and I stated that we had the authority to go anywhere that we wanted to, but we didn't want to create a problem within the service over there. We want safety to be number one. But they do check the bags, that's their job, that's what they get trained for.

LEG. BISHOP:

I just •• and this is a question truly out of my ignorance. The peace officer is a police officer within the airport?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

So it's the same thing within the airport, but once they leave the airport boundary, then they're ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, then they lose that status, they lose the status of police powers. And the Federal Government, my understanding is, unless they change it, says that you have to have police powers because •• this is throughout the country, they're not just dealing with New York State. It's a requirement throughout the country that you have the police powers in the airport. When you leave the airport, they don't care what powers you have because that's not your area of responsibility anymore.

LEG. BISHOP:

Then why don't they have the powers to effect a warrant arrest?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

New York State specifically excludes them, peace officers, from warrant arrests. They didn't want them executing warrants. For whatever reason, the Legislature passed that years ago, I have no idea. But we can do that for them, if they call us.

LEG. BISHOP:

All right. Thank you.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Just one point, Madam Chair. May I?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Sure.

LEG. O'LEARY:

The Islip Town Public Safety Officers, are they state certified?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes, through our police academy.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Through the Suffolk County Police Academy?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes. They get peace officer training. It's required by DCJS.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yes, I'm aware of that. I'm just curious as to whether or not they had that training and that certification.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah. I just had a request from Islip Town for 15 officers to be trained by our police academy, and I said fine. We are going to do that because, again, the safety of our citizens, if they require 15 trained, we're going to do that. It's a separate issue from having the police officers over at the airport. So we're not going to get into that type of thing.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right. So basically if I understand this issue correctly now, it's a question of whether or not the Islip Town Public Safety Officers come under the definition and the requirements and guidelines of the TSA and the federal law with respect to airport security?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

My understanding is they do.

LEG. O'LEARY:

That's the question?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, I've talked to, you know, the County Attorney's Office and Legal, and they tell me that they do.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Lawyers all have difference opinions, no matter who you talk to.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I knew I was going to get questioned on this, and I had •• we had discussed this with the County Executive before it was put in the budget, before this recommendation went in so...

LEG. O'LEARY:

What about the Federal Government or the TSA, have you discussed it with them?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes. Now, they would love for Suffolk County Police to stay there. It's just •• you know, as you were mentioning this before, I'm thinking to myself, it's like the schools would love to keep DARE, people want the Suffolk County Police patrolling the area, and I understand that, the professional Suffolk County Police. But if the federal •• maybe the Federal Government Will come up with the monies to pay for it.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Do I understand you correctly that the County has contacted the Federal Government and TSA, and they had no problem with public safety officers being in ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. No. No. I didn't say that. They were contacted in reference to regulation. I didn't ask them if they were happy with us leaving or staying. We didn't get into that. That wasn't the issue.

LEG. O'LEARY:

The question is if it comes about, will the Federal Government and TSA allow you to do that?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, we may •• they may not have a say in it. Based on their requirements, my understanding is it takes police powers, which the Islip Peace Officers have. If that's their requirement, unless they change it ••

LEG. O'LEARY:

To your knowledge, sir, are there any other airports in the Metropolitan Area or the Tri•State area for that matter that has individuals with peace officer status performing the security?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Any other airport?

LEG. O'LEARY:

To your knowledge.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No, I'm sure if •• what's the airport on the west end? Republic Airport. I believe they're security officers down there.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Hello, Basia, how are you?

MS. BRADDISH:

Good. How are you?

LEG. O'LEARY:

Good.

MS. BRADDISH:

With regard to the federal regulations.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

If you would, just identify yourself.

MS. BRADDISH:

Basia Braddish, County Attorney's Office. With regard to the federal regulations, the definition that they use is LEO, Law Enforcement Officer. It does not specify police, peace, whatever. One of the requirements is that they can carry a gun. Under our Civil Service requirement, there is a title, Airport Security Officer, that has peace officer status. They are trained at the academy, they are certified with the state. That is the positions that mans the Long Island Mac Arthur Police Force, which is what they call themselves.

They submit, they being Long Island Mac Arthur, submits a security plan to the TSA. That plan sets forth how they are going to provide police protection •• security, not police protection. It has nothing to do with the County. The reference to the county in that document specifies that we will augment their services. It provides that, I believe, there a representation that when

called upon, we would respond within ten minutes, I believe is the response. However, we are augmenting, we are not providing the first response services. It's provided •• and the agreement, which we are not a party to, we are not a signatory, is between Long Island Mac Arthur or the town and the TSA.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Madam Chairwoman, if I may.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Sure. Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I would just like to reference Budget Review's findings in the Sheriff's Department when talking about the airport and the TSA, and I'm reading from page 384 here, where they say, "TSA recommendations will require a security officer who will have the power effectuate an arrest with or without a warrant, carry a firearm and be trained in search and seizure. The position of security guards will not meet these standards. It would not be not prudent to hire security guards in 2005 since the use of these positions will not be in compliance with future requirements."

MS. BRADDISH:

That's an overbroad representation, because you do have the ability to provide an arrest without a warrant ••

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

But we just heard that they would not be able ••

MS. BRADDISH:

But you can have ••

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

•• to effectuate an arrest without a warrant. And this says one of the requirements is with or without.

MS. BRADDISH:

No, they can. The police can •• I mean, the security force can effectuate an arrest without a warrant. With a warrant, you can schedule it so that a police officer is there. So that, with the augmentation of the police force that is satisfied.

LEG. O'LEARY:

If I may, Madam Chair. I think ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Let's, one at a time, please.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Just on point there, if I may.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yeah, please.

LEG. O'LEARY:

The individual who's performing the function must have the ability to arrest for a warrant, not call for service.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

What this says is the Federal Government is saying the person on•site.

MS. BRADDISH:

No. That's not how regulations the read, I've read them. That's not how it reads. That's an overbroad representation. You have to have the ability to ••

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

This was the finding that was provided to us, so I would like to see that research further.

MS. BRADDISH:

That's fine.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

And I would like to see the Federal Government's response to this, not us taking this action and then being compelled and then being that the County •• a representative from the County Attorney's Office here, us having to file a lawsuit against someone else because of our actions.

MS. BRADDISH:

That's fine. I have the regulations, I can fax those over to you. I have them in my office.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Please. Thank you.

MS. BRADDISH:

And with the reference to the Deputy Sheriffs, that also probabably in reference to Gabreski and not ••

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

But I assume the Terrorist Preparedness Act would be universal to ••

MS. BRADDISH:

No, they're not.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

•• to commercial operations, though.

MS. BRADDISH:

No. Gabreski ia a general aviation facility, not a commercial facility.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I would think that the commercial •• you know, the responsibilities of an officer of a commercial facility would be higher than a general aviation facility. So if this is •• if these are the requirements for the GAA, I would certainly like to see the Federal Government's findings before take action on this, and wind up embroiled in another lawsuit. You know, let's see, you know, the reaction to this and what the Federal Government's findings are and how exactly those positions, you know, would be in compliance with that. I think a lot of these discussions are moot at this point, because we don't know if these will even comply with that. I mean, you

are saying they are. From what I'm here they would not so...

MS. BRADDISH:

Well, just by way of example, I can suggest that if we took it to the logical extension, then you are saying that they have to put police officers, if we have to put at GA facilities, then you're saying we also have to put them at Republic, which we don't have anybody at currently. We provide that augmentation that we're going to be there within a reasonable amount of time. There are no police officers at Republic Airport.

LEG. O'LEARY:

The State Police are located there.

MS. BRADDISH:

No, they use an augment •• well, they're located there, but they're an augmentation force.

LEG. O'LEARY:

There is a presence of State Police.

MS. BRADDISH:

There's a presence on the perimeter.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Still on•site. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

I have a question for the Commissioner. Do you have the authority right now to order that those officers leave the airport?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. So that the action of including this in the budget certainly wasn't anything that we really have to act. If we as a body feel that those officers should be there, that's our prerogative in setting policy.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, my •• my view is that if we give timely notification that we're removing the officers, we notify Islip that we're moving the officers unless we get reimbursed for the cost, we can do it. I can do it as the Police Commissioner. But I'm certainly not going to •• I'm not going to pull the officers without the Executive and the Legislative Branch being involved in it. It's an issue that I think you should discuss and see if we can come to a solution. But I certainly could pull them out with timely notice. That's my understanding.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

All right. Well, I for one, speaking for myself, this Legislator would not in any way, shape or form endorse or want to be part of anything that would remove police officers from where the public is and where the public deserves to be protected.

And again, as I stated earlier, in this time of enhanced security and the perceived risks that are out there that the public is concerned about and the Federal Government is involved in, this would be the wrong kind of message to send to the tax paying public. Legislator Nowick •• oh, I'm sorry. Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Commissioner, a great deal of this conversation has been based around whether we have the authority or who has the authority to make arrests and monetary issues. I'm more concerned with the safety of the situation. I think it's very encouraging that Islip is increasing their security force, but again, just like the DARE, is this something that we should rush into? I mean, if Islip is increasing their force, maybe we can diminish our force and maybe there can be some kind of phase•in if this is going to become an accepted policy by all the entities. But to do it in one fell swoop, I would have tremendous concerns about the safety of that airport.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

We would consider that. That's a good point.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. Legislator Nowick, did you have a question?

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes. Commissioner, did you say that the Suffolk County PD is not allowed to go inside the terminal?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, we don't run the airport. We are not the authority in the airport, Islip Town is. They set the guidelines, and one of the guidelines some time ago that was brought to my attention was that we would do the perimeter, the parking lot, and the perimeter of the airport, and they weren't allowed in the terminal. They were told what to do. Now, they work for the Police Department, not for Islip. So this was brought to my attention, and we, you know, talked to some people that worked over there that were in charge of that operation, and it's my understanding now that the officers now walk into the terminal. But it's a tenuous situation, it's not a good situation. It's an Islip operation. They command it. They have retired police officers who are in command of that operation. They run it and ••

LEG. NOWICK:

Commissioner, who is responsible for checking the luggage for •• I guess there's •• I know they go through it with this little piece of equipment.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Islip.

LEG. NOWICK:

Who responsible for taking the luggage from the person that flying and putting it in the back and checking the luggage and putting it on the plane?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

We don't do that. Islip does that.

LEG. NOWICK:

Is that Islip?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah.

LEG. NOWICK:

And would there be •• would it be safe to assume that luggage •• luggage that is checked in without •• without the owner of the luggage, is that a situation where the plane would •• they would stop the plane from flying, if a piece of luggage was put on a plane? Is that federal requirements?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

A piece of luggage say is put on a plane, but the •• who is in charge of that?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

They're still in charge, but we'd respond to assist in a situation like that. If the plane was held down and the people had to disembark, we'd be called in to assist Islip in that situation.

LEG. NOWICK:

So Islip security is in charge of making sure that a piece of luggage doesn't get on a plane without a passenger.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

And if they find contraband. They make the arrest, not Suffolk County Police.

LEG. NOWICK:

So the luggage can go on if they don't find contraband? My question is •• no. That's what I want to know.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

It's not Suffolk County Police. We do not do that.

LEG. NOWICK:

Okay. Then I've got to tell you, we have a problem over there, because the luggage does go without the passenger.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I stand corrected. If I may, the Deputy Commissioner said the TSA does the baggage part of it, then they call •• I'm sorry. They do the baggage. They have trained people to do the baggage checks, and if they find contraband, they call the peace officer, Islip Peace Officer, within the facility.

LEG. NOWICK:

And who is responsible for allowing a piece of luggage go on a plane without a passenger?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, I assume it's the TSA now that •• they check the passengers and the baggage.

LEG. NOWICK:

I have to go along ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

They're the screeners.

LEG. NOWICK:

I have to tell you, I have to go along with my colleagues. I don't think there's anything that's more important than the safety of whoever it is that goes on that plane. And I don't think money is more important in this case than the safety of putting anybody on a plane, especially when it comes to any of ourselves, our family members. I mean, this is •• this is something that's very serious. Yes, it's a small airport that everybody said, oh, oh, who's coming out here. That's not true. We need to weigh what's important here, and public safety is first and foremost in this instance. And I have to go along with my colleagues.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

You know, I would agree wholeheartedly with you if we were policing the airport, we're not. We're an adjunct. We're just there, Suffolk County Police, 18 police officers. Islip is policing the airport, they're in charge of it, it's their responsibility. If there's asset forfeiture in the airport, they get it. If there's an arrest inside, they get it, they process them at our precinct. We assist them with that.

LEG. NOWICK:

Well, I have to tell you, I'd still like to see those 18 officers out there when I go to the airport.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I know, but •• I know. And everybody loves to see Suffolk County Police Officers, and that's a reflection on our Police Department, and I thank you for that.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

And to that point. You said that we augment the services, that it's their airport. Well, in this age of doing things regionally and in partnerships, this is something to be embraced and encouraged, not that we are going to say, oh, you have to reimburse us, oh, we are going to pull them out of their, it's not our responsibility. The more we can do working together with other levels of jurisdiction, the better off we're going to be. And an example of that is the fact, as Budget Review noted, that the Town of Islip provides at no cost to the Suffolk County Police Department the land for the facilities for the Special Patrol. These facilities located on the grounds of Mac Arthur Airport include hangar and maintenance space for the Medevac helicopters, office and garage space for Emergency Services Aviation, Crime Scene and Airport Operation sections. We don't pay rent. We don't pay rent, and that is an Islip ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

If I may.

LEG. CARPENTER:

That is an Islip owned facility. And we have our hangar there, we put our Medevac units, but you know what's interesting? At Suffolk County Gabreski Airport where we own the airport, what do you think we pay for rent? Do you think we pay for rent? It's our airport. Do you think we pay for rent there for the Medevac out in Gabreski? Do we?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I have no idea.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

You have no idea. Budget Review, do we pay rent on the County•owned airport at Gabreski? I mean, we don't pay for it at an Islip•owned airport, do we pay for it at the County•owned airport?

MR. SPERO:

We have no County•owned hangar space. It's being used by the fixed based operator, so there's no hangar space available at the moment. And to locate the Medevac there at Gabreski, we had to rent hangar space from a private operator at \$5000 a month.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay. So here we are in a County•owned airport paying for hangar space, and there were are a town•owned airport with a hangar, with our Medevacs and our Emergency Services, and we're not paying rent. Yet, we want to turn around and pull our police officers or look for the money to get reimbursed. Something doesn't sound right.

That airport is also a generator of sales tax revenue, which we all agree helps fund services in this County. Certainly in a •• what is our budget, two point what billion? Two point five billion, in a \$2.5 billion budget we collect \$50 million in property tax. How do we fund all of the services? How do we help fund the Police Department, which is augmented? This year, the sales tax revenue that is helping pay for the Police District has been increased three times over what it was last year. What was it last year and what is the County Executive planning that we fund the Police Department with sales tax revenues this year?

MR. SPERO:

It was 22 million in 2004 and 66 million is proposed for 2005.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. So \$66 million of sales tax revenue over what was 22 million last year is being funded by sales tax revenue. And don't you think and within the confines of that airport that sales tax revenue is generated; car rentals, restaurants, book stores? There's been a whole new wing added that has all of these shops that I'm sure generates a million dollars in sales tax revenue. Oh, by the way, the town does not keep any of the sales tax it generates, it goes to the state, and it goes to the County.

So the very budget that you have to deal with that is enabling you to manage your department and provide services is being generated in a great part by revenues that are generated by that airport, and then also being provided to us is hangar space for our Medevac. So again, I say let's look at doing things together and seeing how we can help one another, because when

people pay, whether they're paying out of the right pocket or the left pocket, they're paying taxes. And whatever we can do to protect the safety of the public and to do it efficiently and effectively, we need to do.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

If I may, I think I should clarify something with the hangars and the space that we utilize over there. These buildings are ours. We built them, Suffolk County, we maintain them, the land is Islip, I grant you that.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

I said that.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

But I don't want anyone to have the impression that the facilities belong to the Town of Islip. The buildings are not Islip. We maintain the buildings. We built them for hangars, for the hangar space and for the officers that are in Special Patrol. And I should say that any facility has that kind of support within three or four minutes of the facility, okay, is blessed in Suffolk County. They are right there at airport if something happens, and that's the reason that they were put in there. If God forbid we have a plane crash, Emergency Services is right there, the helicopter unit is right there. So there's a reason for that.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

And maybe too as we're looking at the fact that the Highway Patrol is no longer going to be based at the old mini center in Bay Shore, and we are looking at space, that sounds like it would be a logical place to put the Highway Patrol. But I don't know if we're going to turn around and pull police officers out how amenable they might be to that suggestion.

I have a question for you on another subject, if anyone else •• if there no other questions on this particular one. You mentioned the aviation unit earlier in your remarks, and I know there have been some problems with down time on the helicopters. And we are in the Operating Budget now and before you turn around, we are going to be looking at the Capital Budget, and I'm hopeful that there will be an effort and recommendation to looking at purchasing other helicopters, because we are providing service both here and on the East End. We are really stretched, would you agree? I mean, is that your thinking?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No. No. I agree that the helicopter service has got to be maintained. It's an expensive item, I understand that, but with this County, the type of service that we provide to the whole County, we have to maintain it. We will be addressing some issues that we have in the helicopter fleet; the manufacturer, the person, the Texas company that has supplied us with parts and training and has manufactured these two helicopters that we have have gone out of business. And it's going to be a major problem for us. It's something that we are going to bring to the County Executive's attention in the short term. We are gathering some data on it right now so that I'll have all the facts so that I can present it to the Executive Branch. But it's something that we are going to be addressing in the next few months.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Great. Thank you very much. There was one number that I jotted down, and I just want to verify what you said. When you talked about police officer who are eligible to retire, did you say that there were 695 who would be eligible to retire in 2005?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes. If you add them all up, that's correct •• well, 20 plus years, 695 that have 20 years. But they normally don't retire at 20 years, but they are eligible.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Right. They're eligible, so that we have nearly 700 officers who if they chose to would be eligible to walk away in 2005?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

This number is much the same every year. It's a number that stays constant every year. So this is not new this year. I want everybody to understand that.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. And you did say you had requested 110 officers to try to •• 111 officers and that you could live with 100. But if you had your druthers, would you prefer to have more officers if we could find a way to fund it?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

When you say more ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

So that the classes would be larger than just 50.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

When you say more...

LEG. CARPENTER:

I mean, instead of the 100 that you said you could live with that we have 110 or 120 or maybe even more of we could find a way to do it within the confines of the budget?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

You know, who wouldn't like more of everything that's good?

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

But I've got to tell you that I looked at this very carefully, and I talked to the Executive Branch about it, and I said 111 was adequate this year, in this year's budget, but I did state that it should be planned every year to hire cops. Suffolk County historically has never done that. They skip a year, which they did ••

LEG. CARPENTER:

Absolutely. I agree with you.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

•• on the last administration. You know, you didn't put in any cops for '04, and now in this budget, we are catching up as best we can. I can deal with having 100 new cops. I think it's adequate for what we have to do, and I think it's fiscally responsible to do it that way.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

The only problem with putting in 100, the attrition rate not •• if you put in 100, you are not

guaranteed that 100 are going to come out of the academy and be police officers.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, I talked to the Executive Branch about that again, and we're going to sign •• they're going to sign extra SCIN forms to anticipate the people who do not make it, that 10%. So instead of putting 50 in, we would probably put 58 or 60 in, because they attrit about ten officers through the course of the academy. So we want to make sure we come out with 50. So I would ask for the extra SCINs to be signed, and it was agreed that we would get that. That, again, was never done before under prior administrations.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Yeah, but then if you asked for 60, and in that second class you've asked for 60, you've only got 100 •• 100 authorized.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

We have •• there are unfilled positions in the budget, police officer positions. I believe that's correct. So we have the ability to do that.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay. Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

In the event that you do that, you take in 60 in the academy instead of the 50, how are the additional ten going to be funded.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, they're already funded. My understanding is that the they're funded •• the budget, the '05 budget will fund a certain number of officers. We do not fill all these positions.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I would like to refer to Budget Review on that issue. If there is •• if the County hires 60, say, in March, they go on payroll, and those monies •• I mean, we are funding 50 and 50, as I understand it, if we do not increase that.

MR. SPERO:

If you want to have two classes of 55, let's say, we would have to increase the permanent salary lines and the equipment lines for the extra officers.

MR. SPERO:

The rest is turnover savings. We only budget for the positions we believe will be filled during that.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Because the Commissioner just stated that this has never been done before where its appropriated 50 and 50, they bring in 60 and 60 because they anticipate by attrit, 10% coming out.

MR. SPERO:

Well, the attrition factor, there is no savings because the SCAT pay, the officers receive when they leave County service. So the more officers that leave during the year, the higher the SCAT pay. So there is no savings in year one when an officer leaves the County payroll. Just for the record, we have, as of October 4th, there were 110 sworn officer vacancies and 37 were in the detective ranks •• the retirements, excuse me.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments to the Commissioner? Okay. Hearing none, I thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Thank you.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay. Next up is FRES.

MR. WILLIAMS:

Good morning.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Hi. If you could identify yourself for everyone, and welcome to the Legislature.

MR. WILLIAMS:

Thank you. Good morning. My name is Joe Williams, I'm the new Deputy Commissioner of FRES, recently appointed. Commissioner Fischler was unable to make it this morning, he has a medical procedure he's going through. He sends his apologies. With me this morning, I have Chief Fire Marshal Warren Horst and also Chief Thomas Kost from the Fire Academy.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Tom, you want come forward, please.

MR. WILLIAMS:

All of us at FRES are very pleased with the County Executive's recommended budget and also the recommendations from the Budget Review Office. These recommendations will allow us on •• our salary accounts are all fully funded, and we are able to fill all existing vacancies in our department. For further comment on the Budget Review, I would like to have Chief Warren Horst speak.

MR. HORST:

Good morning. As the Deputy Commissioner indicated, I think we're very pleased with the budget that's been put forth by the County Executive as well as the positive Budget Review Office comments that we received. The only issue is that •• that we look at this point in time is that the department asks that an office system analyst four position, which was part of our 2005 budget request be restored.

Currently we have one individual on staff who oversees all our computer hardware, software and network matters, this includes a hardware inventory of nine servers, 134 desktop PCs and 36 laptops as well as a multitude of specialized software applications. In our fire, rescue communication center alone, we have the E 911 data network, a location verification mapping system, an automatic alarm monitoring network, electronic dispatch and records management systems, the reverse 911 system and OREIS, which stands for Operation Respond Emergency Information System, and that is a link to the outside world for the rail and truck transport industry in the event that there this some type of emergency involving trucking or transportation corridors.

Additionally, the emergency operation center and the fire rescue communication center both

utilize the E Team event management software and have online weather monitoring systems and backup internet access of the latter two being made available via satellite. In the field, our fire marshals and hazardous materials response teams make use of COBRA. COBRA is a software application that's a response aide for chemical and biological incidents and CAMEO, which is a Computer Aide Management Emergency Operations software application. Both of those require periodic maintenance and upgrading.

Similarly, the department has recently placed into service a new mobile command vehicle with its own local area network on board, satellite internet access system and a computer based communications interoperability system, all of which will require routine attention to maintain current and operate effectively. Of course, we also operate the typical networks found in most County offices that support the day to day computing needs of the department, I wish it supported the commuting needs, including IFMS and the personal payroll system.

Most importantly, the scope of the department's electronic automation will dramatically expand in the immediate future. Last week, an award letter was issued for a multi million dollar computer aided dispatch project that will bring our fire rescue communications center into the 21st Century. In itself, this project will require the full•time attention of at least one person with an extensive background in electronic data processing systems, to oversee the project's development, implementation, and the successful transition from the existing dispatch system to the new one.

We believe the broad scope of the department's data processing systems, applications, and hardware clearly warrant the additional position. We therefore, respectfully request the office system analyst four title be funded in our 2005 budget. I'll turn it back to the Deputy Commissioner unless there are any questions.

LEG. CARPENTER:

On that position, what grade is that?

MR. HORST:

Let me look it up instead of guessing.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I believe it's on page 248. I believe it's grade 28.

MR. HORST:

I would concur with that.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay. Thank you.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I have a question.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Legislator Lindsay. I'm sorry.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Legislator Bishop had to step out of the room, but he had a concern that we would like an opinion from you guys. REMSCO has come down with some new mandates, and some of our volunteer are telling us that the we might need more communications or software to adapt to that. Can you guys •• do you know what I'm talking about or what he is talking about?

MR. HORST:

One of the issues that is associated with the REMSCO protocol is the crew confirmation where they call in. And currently, we are dispatching for about 55 fire departments and 19 volunteer ambulance corps. And of those, we actually do the total dispatch for 31 of them. I believe about ten currently have crew confirmation call•ins. So if in fact this protocol goes into effect, say, the first of the year, we would need have somebody on staff to handle additional 21 agencies that will start calling in for crew confirmation. That would be for emergency medical incidents. And we are running about 110,000 •• 109,000 in the County on an annual basis.

LEG. LINDSAY:

He wasn't talking about personnel, he was talking about equipment. You have know idea?

MR. HORST:

Unless he's referring to the computer aided dispatch, which the award letter was issued last week, we will be negotiating a contract and hopefully start implementation of that system in the

first quarter of next year.

LEG. LINDSAY:

But we have the money in the budget?

MR. HORST:

That's in the Capital program, it's been funded, 10% match by Suffolk County and a 90% match by the State of New York through a grant program.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS:

Chief Kost, can you speak on the fire academy, please.

MR. KOST:

Thank you. We also agree with the budget as written. We have no problems with the budget. And the only thing we were talking with the Budget Review people, and the statement, the fire academy student attendance has steadily decreased over the past years. I have the •• all the statistics, and I'm going to ask Mr. Dick Stockinger, who's the Assistant Deputy Director of the Fire Academy, one of our new people to give each one of you a copy of it. But based on our projections, this year will be equal to or greater than last year, which was 45,208 student contacts. In 2002, 46,265. We have been running above average since 2001 on our student training. We usually are in the 34 35,000 student contacts per year. And since those •• since the events of 9/11, there's been more training, more training required, more technical training. And we have had been providing it.

So we anticipate this year to be some where between 45 and 46,000 student contacts also. But based upon the Budget Review Committee, we agree with their findings. We can hold off on that one position, which is the Chief of Program Development who would be responsible for formulating the new programs. We feel that will be able to absorb that and, therefore, we

accept the budget as proposed.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Thank you. And you did share those figures with BRO on the attendance?

MR. KOST:

Yes, we did. Yes. They have a copy.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Great. Thank you very much. Are there any questions or comments for FRES? Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

Just quickly, do I read this, in August there were 3348 students? Is that how many you have?

MR. KOST:

That's the running total? That's 3348; is that correct?

LEG. NOWICK:

That per month?

MR. KOST:

That is the month. This month, October, with probably be in the 5,000 range student contacts.

LEG. NOWICK:

I had no idea there were that many.

MR. KOST:

Oh, yeah, we're very busy.

LEG. NOWICK:

Thank you.

MR. KOST:

You're welcome.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay. Thank you very much, gentlemen, and thanks for your patience in waiting. Good luck to you in your new position. Next, we have probation, it's on page 332. Whenever you're ready.

MR. DESMOND:

Thank you. Good morning. With me, I have Dr. James Golbin, who is our Chief Planner for Probation and Ms. Karlene Maimoni, who is Director of Program Evaluation. My name is John Desmond, I'm the director.

Needless to say, we are very happy, as everybody else seems to be, we with the budgetary actions by both the County Executive's Office and by BRO, and we appreciate the support and the nice things that were said. There's a few things I would like to go over in the BRO report. We don't want to take up too much of your time today.

On page 320, the permanent salary expenditures, it talks about remaining 17 vacancies can be filled for half the year. My only concern there is that we have two psychiatric social worker positions at the Day Reporting Center that I really believe should be filled as quickly as possible. The Day Reporting Center has been getting far more people with severe psychiatric problems, and those positions would allow us to more successfully treat those individuals.

Moving onto from there, I just want to touch on page 322, on some of the highlights of new expanded initiatives. The first one is the past point substance abuse screener. We have some hope for this technology.

LEG. CARPENTER:

I think we have different page numbers. Are you working from the BRO report?

MR. SPERO:

He is working from the downloaded copy, which we had •• okay. To make a long story short, when we ••

LEG. CARPENTER:

That's okay. We don't need the details. So, just tell us what at the top of the page so we can find it.

MR. DESMOND:

My apologies. The top of the page I'm looking at is •• has a little grid for appropriations. So past point, it's a technology that will allow us to check for substance abuse without doing intrusive urines. We have some hopes for that technology for our locations that screen the same probationers on a frequent basis. While we feel this technology is useful for something like day reporting centers or for drug court, because of the limitations of the software involved, we don't think it's going to be useful for our regular caseloads, because there we have too many individuals coming in on too many different occasions at too many locations. The past point systems require individuals to come in into be identified by retinal scan. That identification initially and for the first couple of times they come in, requires a fair amount of time to register.

So while we do have some hopes for this for certain locations, for the regular caseloads, we think we are going to continue to rely on the urines being taken on the probationers. But again, as the software, it's mostly a software problem, continues to improve, we may be able to three, four years down the road use this kind of technology for our general caseloads. On the expansion of the DWI Alternative Program, there was a recommended change in name of the appropriation. We've already done that.

On the Alternatives for Youth Program, we believe that this program will be very effective in dealing with the parents PINS and result in some significant savings among the parents PINS placements. BRO requested that at some point, we combine the budget numbers, and we'll do. We agree with them also that we want to do a thorough analysis of this program, and we'll provide that information to you as it's developed.

With the late lamented, at least I lately lament, the children's shelter, I would like to inform you that the County Executive has reached out to County Executive Suozzi of Nassau County, and preliminary discussions have begun for two possibilities. First, would be another attempt for contract for some space at the Nassau facility. And the other possibility that we are beginning to go look at is the creation of a regional children shelter. That's of course, just in the initial conversations, and I will get back to with any progress. Before we ••

LEG. CARPENTER:

Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

John, don't we currently ship our juveniles out of County, and don't some of them go to Nassau now?

MR. DESMOND:

Right. But we have know no contract with any facility anywhere in this state where they're obligated to hold a certain number of beds for Suffolk County. We had attempted that with Nassau four or five years ago, but at that point, Nassau suddenly had a spike in their juvenile population, and they basically rescinded the agreement with us.

LEG. LINDSAY:

And how would this regional approach work? We would •• Nassau already has a facility, what, would we with ask them to expand it and share the cost with them?

MR. DESMOND:

Right. We would be looking •• if we went for a regional facility, we would be looking for new location and a larger facility. How large a facility depends on the cooperation of the state, which is •• goes back to our usual problem again. Before we got involved in anything like this, we would want a firm commitment from the state as to how many beds they would agree to let us construct. And hopefully we would have in writing.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Does it appear that the ill advised decision of the state to not let us go forward with our own facility is going to be reversed?

MR. DESMOND:

I see no reason from many conversations I have had with the state at this point to look for any reversal of that position by the state. We have had no further formal communication from them regarding the statistics that we had sent up to them from the last contact we had with them. As part of the ongoing discussion with Nassau County, the next step that I will be taking will be to reach out to the state to request exactly what they might have in mind as to the number of

beds they would view as appropriate in a regional shelter. If it turns out to be too few, then it would not be reasonable for Nassau to go along with this.

LEG. CARPENTER:

I appreciate the fact that the County Executive has reached out to County Executive Suozzi. Has he reached out to the state officials that represented us on this issue with the shelter, and what has happened?

MR. DESMOND:

I believe there has been some conversation with some state officials. I know the County Executive had spoken to the Governor's Office on this, but I don't know of anything that has arisen since the failure of the state to communicate with us either positively or negatively in September, which led to the demise of the shelter proposal.

LEG. CARPENTER:

It seems that he would be •• you know, we all would be better served if he perhaps would reach out to members of the Long Island delegation, especially those from Suffolk County, you know, with the information that we have, with the correspondence that we have had. And, I mean, they represent us in Albany. You know, more targeted than reaching out to the Governor's office, I think that might be more fruitful.

MR. DESMOND:

I will be speak with the County Executive's Office, and if appropriate I'll set up a package for each of the Legislators to keep them up to date with what's happening?

LEG. CARPENTER:

Thank you. Is there anything else?

MR. DESMOND:

Let's see. I want to quickly get through this. On the CJCC, Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, the only request that we would make in this is the recommended budget includes two positions, one a chief planner, we would like that to be made a chief planner for criminal justice. And the other one calls for a research technician. And our preference would be for there to be a planner criminal justice. That job title does exist in Civil Service, but has been, I guess, mothballed is the best word for it, for quite some time. There's grade firmly •• currently

attached, but Civil Service is going to get back to me on that, and I'll provide that information when I get it. The only other remarks that I want to make are •• three short ones. First one, on the Red Cross Community Service, they have a new director of the Community Service Program. We have met with the director, we are very happy with her. Her name is Hope _Collozzo_.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

What is that?

MR. DESMOND:

Hope _Collozzo_ is the new director. We've been •• we've had a couple of meetings with her already. They are actively working on revamping their staff, and I'm hope that we are going to see some additional improvements over there in terms of efficiency and timeliness.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Is she from within the organizations or?

MR. DESMOND:

No. She was brought in from the outside. She has a history with non for profits, and one time, she was with the Army. She seem very effective, a good communicator. We're also expecting the final audit to come in. And upon that, we hope next year then to put out a new RFP as it's been a number of years since the last one. And with that, just the other points I want to just quickly go over. We've had two recent developments in Family Court. The first one is last Friday, after conversations with Judge Freundlich. We took our first female into the Juvenile Day Reporting Center. Judge Freundlich had indicated that he has three or four female juveniles, that it's intention to place in Kids Peace if they couldn't come into the JDRC. The cost of Kids Peace per year is \$180,000. The total cost of the Juvenile DRC is 770,000 for all the children served.

We're going to make every effort to get as many females into the program as possible. We're not sure what the ramifications are going to be, but we're working with the program to make whatever adjustments are necessary, including transferring staff around. The other point that I would the subcommittee to be aware of is that Judge Freundlich is intending starting in January to have a number of the youthful offenders transferred from the criminal parts over to Family

Court. We're not sure what the long term impact is going to be of that. It may be a reduction in jail population. It could be an increase in our residential costs. As that develops, we will be informing you. That's all I have. Thank you very much for your cooperation and assistance.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you. Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Just one question regarding that second item about the final audit about to be concluded. Then you stated that then you were going to be floating a new RFP.

MR. DESMOND:

Yes.

LEG. O'LEARY:

For what purpose?

MR. DESMOND:

We're, I think, three years over on that. We are three years past the point where we should have put out a new RFP. So I would be much happier if we did bring one out. We want other agencies not for profits to have •• for the Community Service, I'm sorry, I didn't make that clear?

LEG. O'LEARY:

I wasn't clear.

MR. DESMOND:

The Community Service Program, both adults and juvenile.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right. That was my question, what was it for. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Any other questions? Thank you. Thank you for your patience. The only other issue we had was Legal Aid. I don't know if there's anyone here from Legal Aid, but the BRO

recommendation was to add 117,000 for four attorneys assigned to the Intergrated Domestic Violence Program, and hopefully that will be taken care of with the Omnibus Resolution, the addition to Legal Aid, the 117 for the four attorneys for Domestic Violence. Is there anyone else who wanted to address the committee on Public Safety issues? Hearing none, we stand adjourned. Thank you.

(* THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:47. A.M. *)

_ _ DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY